RESTORATION REVIEW

The Church of Christ upon earth is essentially, intentionally and constitutionally one; consisting of all those in every place that profess their faith in Christ and obedience to him in all things according to the Scriptures, and that manifest the same by their tempers and conduct.

Thomas Campbell

Volume 11, No. 5 May, 1969

Volume 11, No. 5 **Leroy Garrett, Editor** **May 1969**

A Scriptural Call for Renewal . . .

MARANATHA: Come, Lord Jesus!

Be like men who are waiting for their master to come home.—Lk. 12:36

God's community on earth today hardly behaves as a people awaiting the Lord's coming. There is no greater sign of secularism in our age than the impact that this world and its allurements have had upon the Lord's people. We act as if the world will go on and on, and there seems to be little thought given to *last things,* what the theologians call eschatology. So we can say that the modern church is hardly eschatologically minded. The affairs of this world hang heavily upon us. If the world lives as if there were no God, the church does little better. Secularism has long since blurred any distinction there may have been between the church and the world.

It may be unfair to say that in our own churches of Christ we have be come oblivious to the second coming of Christ, and yet we can hardly assert that we are a people "looking for and hastening the coming of the day of God" (2 Pet. 3:12). If one closely observes our prayers in the assemblies, he will notice that the Lord's coming is hardly ever referred to. The chances are that many who read this article, reared in the Church of Christ, have not once heard the primitive prayer of *Maranatha* (Come, Lord Jesus!) uttered in our services. Almost never will one hear a prayer among our people that is *centered* in the hope of Jesus' coming. And yet this was a common petition in the early congregations.

Our preaching and teaching are equally remiss in this regard. Neither is it a frequent subject of conversation. There are but occasional references to it in our journals. A survey of subjects in college lectureships through the years will reflect the same thing. We show no indication of having the Lord's coming on our minds. We simply do not think about it, not often certainly.

An important exception to this are the hundred-odd premillennial congregations among us. Here one finds the hope of His coming a glorious reality. It is apparent in every expression of worship among the premills. Even in their private conversations they may be heard to say, "If the Lord tarries. .", they will do such and such. One gets the impression that they are continually aware of the Lord's coming. They are more like the primitive Christians in this regard than the rest of us.

R. H. Boll, the father of premillennialism in Churches of Christ, once charged that our people had sacrificed the precious hope of His coming in order to combat the influence of premillennialism. The charge may have some truth to it. For decades now our teaching on the second coming has been largely negative.

Maranatha, coming from the Aramaic, was a foreign term to the early Greek-speaking Christians, but they were probably unaware of it, just as we do not realize that *sabbath, amen, hallelujah, and* even *baptism* are foreign terms in our language. It means something like *Our Lord, come!,* and it was one of the earliest prayers directed to Jesus. It is similar to the cry of *Abba,* also from the Aramaic and also a prayer.

It was a watchword or password among the early Christians. Being a term unknown to their enemies, the saints could whisper it to each other in passing or in gaining entrance to secret meetings. Not only was it an ejaculatory prayer, spontaneously uttered in the assembly as well as in private, but also a confession of faith that the Lord lives and will come again.

While *Maranatha* occurs only in 1 Cor. 16:22, it is evident that it was a common reference in the early community of believers. The term occurs in the *Didache,* a second-century manual of faith and order, and it is in the writings of the church fathers.

There may be a relationship between spirituality and a vital hope in the second coming. The more worldly and secular the Christian becomes the less concern he has for the Lord's coming. The primitive saints were poor, deprived, persecuted, hated. The Lord's coming meant deliverance from their woes. The modern Christian loves his world. The business world, TV, the stock market, sports, money, fun, houses all have strong appeal. When one is healthy, accepted by society, affluent and comfortable, he is not hankering for the present order to come to an end. Even when one is quite aware of the evil in the world, the challenge to make things better makes life an enticing experience. If he gives it any thought at all, he had just as soon that the Lord delay His coming until his own allotted years have passed.

There is a problem here for the modern Christian. Just as God loves the world the believer is to love the world. He has the mission to make the world better, to serve humanity. That mission is a happy one, filled with exciting adventure. Despite all the tragedy and evil man finds himself in love with life. And yet the implication of the Christian faith is that he should desire the coming of Christ, which would bring the world as he knows it to an end.

Paul's attitude in his correspondence with the Philippians may provide an answer to this. He made it clear that he wanted to keep on living in this world, one reason being that he might serve the Philippians who so badly needed his help. Yet he wanted to be with the Lord. He says: "I am caught between two desires, for I have my desire to strike camp and to be with Christ, which is far better; but for your sake it is more essential for me to remain in this life."

But the key to his thinking is in his famous statement "For me to live is Christ." Christ is the beginning and the end of life, the inspiration of life, the strength of life. Christ *is* life. Whether Paul lived or died, Christ would be in him, the dynamic of life. So, it all becomes

a matter of God's will, what He wants for us. Life in this world is precious because it is *life in the Son,* even with its reverses. The life that shall be ours at the Lord's coming will not be different in kind, but only in degree. We will be nearer the presence of Christ. It will be an enrichment and a perfection of the life we now enjoy in Him.

So it is a matter of going from better to best. To live in Christ in this world is *better.* To be with Him in His coming is *best.* It is the culmination of all that God has intended for us.

Life does not have to be cruel and oppressive for us to meaningfully cry out *Maranatha.* However sweet life is, it is sweetened by the presence of Christ through His Spirit. Yet He is our *absent* friend and loved one. The Spirit helps us while He is away. Surely if we love Him and desire His personal presence, a communion that can be ours only by His return, we will eagerly anticipate His coming.

It is tragic that many Christians look to the Lord's coming with fear and trembling. They would be terribly upset at the thought of His coming today. They are afraid they are not ready, fearful that the good they have done does not outweigh the bad. Such ones have failed to understand what it means to be saved by grace, to be secure in His love. Paul assures us that we have passed from death into life, and that there is no judgment for those who are in Christ. It is only on such grounds that we can ejaculate "Come, Lord Jesus!" If it depends on our works or our goodness, we are all doomed.

The long and short of it is whether we really love Jesus. If He is ours and we are His, we will have joy at the thought of His coming. If a phone call reveals that a dear and precious friend is coming, there will be rejoicing, not dread or fright. And so if the peal of heavenly trumpets reveal the coming of the Son of God—our friend, saviour, and Lord—we will be overjoyed and will hasten to meet Him.—*Maranatha! Come, Lord Jesus!*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

FREEDOM AT ABILENE

We all know about the unrest on college campuses across the nation. Those closest to the scene are taking a long look at what the causes may be, all of which are surely related in some way to the uneasiness within society at large. Campus revolt is a symptom of the national disease of loss of direction. Frustration and desperation lie in the wake of meaninglessness. A nation that is unsure of its sense of values will surely lose its youth. The campus rebel is telling us that he is *lost.* Paul Tillich would prefer to call it *alienation.* It all adds up to irrational conduct. And when man has lost his sense of mission he will be irrational.

This has to do with the principle of freedom in a very important way. The boiling campus cauldrons have served as cruel reminders that we are less free today than we were yesterday. Only a disciplined people are a truly free people. Riots on the campuses and in the ghettoes have laid bare our lack of discipline. Our values have bogged down in our preoccupation with things.

We hardly know how to talk with each other any more. Not only is there a generation gap, but a moral gap as well. An accomplished violinist, who has attained excellence through a lifetime of rigid self-discipline, is a freer man than the musician who is only mediocre because he never learned to say no to himself. The free man has learned the wisdom of self-restraint. It is the unfree man who must be restrained by others. We see it in the campus revolt. The punk who takes over the office of the college president, propping his feet on the prexy's desk and smoking his cigars, is *unrestrained* because he is unfree. Above all else he wants the dignity that only freedom can give. His desperation lies in the fact that he never learned to be free. The same can be said for the nation that produced him. Far from being an age of reason, ours is an era of irrationality. Desperation haunts our way.

This is all as evident on the campuses of Church of Christ colleges as anywhere. It may be a *quieter* desperation, but it is as insidious as that at Cornell, Berkeley or Columbia. And to those near the scene it is as apparent. Professors have been fired (some of the better ones, as is usually the case); others are resigning or threatening to resign in large numbers; students are demonstrating, though still on tiptoe; petitions are being circulated; heresy hunters are stalking in the hallways; and even "inquisitions" are being held, to quote a Disciples editor in his comments over recent events at Freed-Hardeman College in Tennessee. Moreover, doctrinal statements are being demanded of faculty people, something new in the story of Church of Christ colleges.

It is the same desperation that broods over campuses throughout the land. We have become nervous and unsure of ourselves. We have turned to academic stuttering, a symptom traceable to causes similar to those that make a man stammer in his speech. It is a fear that *something* might happen, something that we cannot handle, or something with no handles on it.

An illustration of all this is the kind of freedom being dished up out at Abilene Christian College, Out in the West where liberty, like babies, is both assumed and prized.

The college has just released a statement on "Academic Freedom and Tenure in Abilene Christian College," a four-page document that endorses the position taken by agencies of higher learning on academic freedom.

But there is a "rider" attached, a qualification that may augur ill for many an unsuspecting professor in years to come. Not that ACC needs any such clauses, hidden or otherwise, to dispose of its controversial faculty people, for a number in recent years have

left “under fire,” without the need of any stated limitation to the accepted norms of academic freedom. The principle of “due process” is yet to be discovered by the administrations of most of our colleges.

The basic principles of academic freedom that ACC subscribed to were initiated by the American Association of University Professors and the Civil Liberties Union and more recently supported by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and the Coordinating Board of Texas College and University System. Most Texas colleges and universities have accepted the statements *without* qualification.

The principles boil down to the idea that an instructor is to be *free* in the pursuit of truth and in his teaching of what he sees to be truth. He is to be at liberty to express his opinions on all questions related to his discipline, however controversial those questions may be. There is to be no pressure or duress from the authorities over him. He is limited in what he says in the classroom only by his own sense of professorial responsibility and is not to be dictated to by the administration or pressured by his colleagues. Moreover, the college should seek to maintain the kind of academic environment that the instructor will be *encouraged* to pursue every avenue open to him, without prejudice, in examining all sides of every question.

The ACC statement says: *Abilene Christian College accepts the foregoing statement, with the qualification that this is a Christian college, and, as such, it has certain responsibilities not found in every institution.*

Surely an institution that professes to be Christian has a mission and a message that is distinctive. One is left to wonder, however, how this would effect an instructor’s freedom on the campus. Academic freedom as generally accepted does not give a teacher the license to say or do *anything.* A Harvard professor was fired for LSD activity, while an instructor at Texas was dismissed for advocating revolution. Immorality and incompetency have long been reasons for firing instructors in institutions that unequivocally adhere to the principle of academic freedom.

In other words the teacher is limited by the principle of freedom itself. He is free to pursue truth without interference, but the quest for truth obligates him to be both reasonable and responsible. This is defined by all that is meant by *liberal education.*

One wonders what further limitation a Christian institution would want to place upon an instructor than this. Is an English teacher, for example, to teach Shakespeare or Chaucer any differently at Abilene than at Rice? Suppose it is a *Christian* teacher who is exploring Shakespeare with his students. Is it “Christian education” when he does so at Abilene, but “secular” when he does so at Rice? When he moves from one campus to the other, does he change his Shakespeare? What further limitation would Abilene place upon him that he does not already place upon himself by virtue of the dignity of his profession in his teaching at Rice?

The ACC statement continues: *In the Christian college, as well as in other institutions of higher learning, there should be a proper balance between academic freedom and academic responsibility. Freedom in an orderly society is always limited and never absolute.*

Here ACC is saying that all colleges are alike is recognizing that freedom implies responsibility. All will likewise agree that freedom is limited and never absolute. The accepted statements on academic freedom, of course, recognize this, as we have already suggested. The point of our concern is what further restrictions ACC feels compelled to impose upon the professor beyond those accepted by all responsible academicians. The next statement tells us.

The freedom of a teacher in Abilene Christian College, therefore, is limited by his relationships in society, by the authority of the Scriptures, and by those purposes for which the college exists.

The first and last of these restrictions could hardly be questioned. Even as I sit at my desk this moment in my own home my freedom is limited by my relationships in society. I am not free to step outside and chunk rocks at my neighbors' windows. How many more limitations are upon me as an educator in the community! I am not free to dress, speak and act just any old way. It would follow that the greater my responsibility in the community or the university the more restricted my freedom would be. The mayor of a great city or the president of a university can hardly go anywhere, not even on a vacation, without being subject to immediate recall at any time.

So with the last. If I cannot respect the objectives and purposes of a college, I should not join its faculty. I once served on the staff of a Christian college where there was an instructor who vented his spleen over "this Jesus bit" and was always poking fun at Christian values. He should not have been on the faculty. This does not mean that an infidel should not serve on a Christian faculty, but that he should be an unbeliever who at least respects religious faith as held by others. A college's philosophy should be clearly stated to prospective faculty, and if they find themselves unsympathetic with it they should seek employment elsewhere.

It is the second qualification that ACC states that troubles me. The teacher is limited in his freedom *by the authority of the Scriptures.* If it read *by his respect for the Scriptures,* it could hardly be questioned. Even an infidel teaching at ACC could properly be expected to respect the Scriptures, but I don't see how a college could place such a one under *the authority of the Scriptures.*

But this is not the main difficulty. Assuming that it is proper for an ACC instructor to be limited in his freedom by the authority of the Scriptures, who is to be the interpreter of the Scriptures when a question arises about something the instructor has said or believes?

Weigh the point well. You are an instructor at Abilene and you are a free man in the classroom—free to pursue truth with your students. But you are restricted *by the authority of the Scriptures.* If this means you are allowed to be your own interpreter of the Scriptures, then your freedom would not be impaired. If this is what ACC means, well and good. I consider myself under the authority of the Scriptures whether I am a teacher, business man or coach. But I zealously defend my right to interpret the Scriptures for myself. I have no yen for someone else to sit as a supreme court over my own conscience.

But I am fearful that ACC means something else when they talk about an instructor being limited by the authority of the Scriptures. Past performances at Abilene and at other of our colleges would indicate that the professor is limited *by the traditions of a party.* One of our colleges dismissed several profs because they believed in tongue-speaking. Others have been fired for being "liberal," which means everything from accepting other believers as Christians to playing down the big deal that we've made of instrumental music. We could put together a rather large and highly competent faculty made up of men fired by Church of Christ colleges, representing virtually every field of teaching. In each case the man was fired because he crossed the party line, which has the alias of "violating the authority of the Scriptures."

Again we ask, who is going to be the interpreter out Abilene way when a problem arises about what a professor believes or teaches? The trustees? The administration? A faculty committee? All may agree that the Scriptures are authoritative, including the instructor in question. But who is going to say what the Scriptures mean in the case in question?

I should like to ask some questions about what limitations "the authority of the Scriptures" would place upon an ACC teacher.

Would a biology teacher be free to present the theory of evolution alongside creationism, explaining that it *is his* personal conclusion that evolution is the stronger case, while all along respecting the opposing viewpoint?

Could a sociologist express as his opinion the appropriateness of the dance in the life of youth, that the Church of Christ might do well to follow other religious groups and have dances for their youth in fellowship halls, that since ACC'ers do so much parking, they should not get too excited about a little dance? All of this said, of course, in a friendly way and in an effort to get people to think and to be honest.

Could a teacher dealing with social problems point out that a case can be made for *moderate* drinking, and that he sees this consistent with the Scriptures, for Jesus was himself a drinker, and that the most serious problems related to drinking occur with people from *non-drinking* homes where the parents made a big deal out of it? Could he add that, in fact, he himself has for years taken a toddy just before going to bed and that he has

found it a meaningful Christian experience, even more than overeating at Catchings cafeteria?

Would a Bible teacher be free to espouse the documentary hypothesis, date Daniel in the Maccabean period, or question the Pauline authorship of the pastoral epistles? Not dogmatically of course, but as views held tentatively, as having the stronger case in his research at the time.

Could a teacher gently suggest that we must forget this bit about being the only Christians and *the* true church, that there are surely Christians in many denominations, and that we do well when we are Christians only without bothering to be the only Christians? Can he suggest that the boundaries of fellowship should be extended to include all those who are in Christ, whether Baptists, premills, or Christian Church folk?

Would an English teacher be free to assign something like *Ulysses* for literary criticism and Christian dialogue, believing that the Scriptures authorize this kind of confrontation with the problem of evil?

Would an instructor in political science be free to be a left-wing Kennedy man as much as a right-wing Goldwater man? Could he be an enthusiast for Americans for Democratic Action as easily as a Bircher?

Could he, while a professor at ACC, transfer his membership from the College Church of Christ to the First Christian Church?

Answers to such questions would help us to understand what academic freedom means at Abilene Christian College.

If we are to be a free people of God, then the authority of the *Scrip*tures must always be *personal* rather than institutional. Even a priest teaching in a Roman Catholic seminary has a kind of freedom, one limited by the traditions of his church. A teacher at ACC must be free to teach *as he sees it* or freedom has no meaning. If the way he sees it is in conflict with the way the Church of Christ has always been seeing it, or different from the way the administration sees it, he must be allowed to be different. He has the right to be *wrong*—wrong being anything different from what we've always taught!—*the Editor*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

"Declaration and Address": Mandate for Renewal . . .

THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH

Restorationists have always been especially conscious of the nature of the church. In their concern for apostasy or a falling away, it is in their minds the church that has been corrupted. Restoration therefore involves renewal through a recovery of the pristine purity

of the church. This refers to its name, terms of membership, mission, work and worship, its government and its institutions. In short, *the character or nature of the church.*

The Campbells were no less concerned than other restorationists in the character of God's community on earth. One of Alexander Campbell's first and most important series of essays was on "The Ancient Order of Things," which probed the essential character of the primitive *ecclesia.* It is noteworthy than in Thomas Campbell's *Declaration and Address,* where he submits thirteen propositions as the basis for reform, the very first proposition begins with "That the church of Christ…"

In our own time most of us agree that there is a great need to "take up where the Campbells left off" or to "continue the Restoration Movement." In this noble concern we are to be no less conscious of the nature of the church than they were. While we are eager to learn whatever our pioneers can teach us about the church, we are not to be content with anything less than an understanding of *the relevance of the church to our time.*

It may be that the Campbells are yet far beyond us in their grasp of the character of the community of God, and that we could hardly do better for ourselves than to learn what has long been available to us—the wisdom of our own pioneers. Especially is there a need to study their findings in the light of our own problems. This is our purpose in this installment of our survey of the *Declaration and Address.*

We intend to show that it has much to say to our time, not only to our own divided and confused ranks, but to the Christian world at large in its concern for ecumenism.

Church Is Essentially One

That the church of Christ is essentially, intentionally, and constitutionally one; consisting of all those in every place that profess their faith in Christ and obedience to him in all things according to the scriptures, and that manifest the same by their tempers and conduct, and of none else, as none else can be truly and properly called christians.

This first proposition contains the most famous line Thomas Campbell ever wrote: *The church is essentially, intentionally, and constitutionally one.*

This proposition is the basic premise from which all else is developed. It was this precious truth, once realized, that caused Mr. Campbell to invite to the Lord's table Christians other than those of his own communion, which led to his being reprimanded by his superiors in the Anti-Burgher Seceder Presbyterian Church. It was indeed this truth that led him to disassociate himself from any and all sectarian bodies, to become a Christian-at-large, and to eventually start his own association of Christians, which he did not intend to become another denomination.

If the community of heaven is essentially, intentionally and constitutionally one, then it is its very character to be united. Anything divisive or factious cannot be the church. To the extent that Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian churches—*and* Christian Churches and

Churches if Christ represent *parties* within Christendom, they are not *the body of Christ.* Members of such groups may well be true believers and members of the only church there is, but the organizations themselves cannot be churches. There is but one church, and by its very nature it cannot be divided. It cannot be two or two hundred. It is *constitutionally* one, as Campbell says.

That the church is *intentionally* one points to the divine purpose rather than to human expediency. It is not because the church in our time would be more effective that it should be united, or that it would be more acceptable with the masses, but because it is God's intention that it be one. In this respect we can speak of unity as an end itself, for it conforms to heaven's purpose for the church.

In saying the church is *essentially* one, Campbell is saying that it really cannot be otherwise. Just as the church will always be, the gates of hell being unable to withstand it, it will always be one. It is to say that unity is something to be realized, not something to be achieved. As Eph. 4:3 puts it: "Be eager to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." We are to *maintain* a oneness that already exists, not to bring into being a unity that is absent.

It is like restoring a precious painting that is corroded with dirt and grime. The rich, beautiful colors are already there, but have long since been begrimed by neglect and abuse. Renewal is not a matter of *adding* something new, but of *subtracting* something superfluous. It is the nature of the painting to display objects in lively and attractive colors and designs. This it does when the ugly accruements are removed. One does not do this by creating all sorts of imitations of the painting.

It would be appropriate if representatives from all the denominations of the world would assemble and declare that the church of God upon earth is one, thus acknowledging its essential unity. This would be a repudiation of all sectarianism and an admission that no denomination can be the body of Christ. Denominationalism is part of the grime that must be removed, thus restoring the pristine beauty of the one church.

Character of Its Members

Campbell sees the congregation of Christ as composed of "all those in every place that profess their faith in Christ and obedience to him in all things according to the scriptures, and that manifest the same by their tempers and conduct." He goes on to insist that only such ones can truly be called Christians.

Both of the Campbells were disturbed over the moral depression that characterized the American frontier. There has been no period in our history when we were so threatened with a collapse of morality as that immediately following the Revolutionary War. The moral breakdown followed the frontier west. The Campbells believed that religious bickering and partyism aided and abetted the immorality.

They thus saw the church as made up of those "called to be saints," who had turned their backs upon the ways of the world. They took the injunction seriously that "without holiness no man can see the Lord," and they insisted that one is not properly called a Christian unless he lives an exemplary life.

A student of the literature of the Campbells may be surprised to find so much attention given to the subject of morality. There were extended installments on "Christian Morality," and in it all there was the conviction that the character of Christians would never be what it should until the believer accepts the Lordship of Christ in his life.

Alexander Campbell expressed the view that the church can no more be ruled by a book than it can by a pope. "No book ever governed any community," he insisted. Until one is ruled by the indwelling Christ there will be no Christian morality.

Might there not be many who profess to be Christians, even among those in the leadership of the church, who are not really in the church at all? The character of one's own life, what he is on the inside, may well negate anything he may profess outwardly.

In the second of his thirteen principles Thomas Campbell basis discipleship upon receiving other believers on the same ground that Jesus receives us.

That although the church of Christ upon earth must necessarily exist in particular and distinct societies, locally separate one from another; yet there ought to be no schisms, no uncharitable divisions among them. They ought to receive each other as Christ Jesus hath also received them to the glory of God. And for this purpose. . . to be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.

There is nothing trite about this statement. The words should weigh heavily upon our conscience, for the heirs of the Campbell movement have been the most remiss in heeding this plea for peace within the body of our Lord. He is saying that Christian union is far more than mere cooperation. People can cooperate in projects of mutual interest without really receiving each other as brothers. And it is part of Christian character to accept others in the Lord, just as the Lord has accepted us.

Here is a test for a congregation too seldom used. More important than how often they break bread or whether they use an organ is whether they accept the group of believers down the street as their brothers and treat them as such. We have not been taught to realize how serious it is to reject as a fellow Christian one that Jesus has accepted. "Welcome him who is weak in the faith" is probably among our people the most neglected prescription of all the Bible. It has not quite dawned on us that it is *sinful* to reject a man that Christ has accepted.

Terms of Membership

We must keep in mind that as early as 1809 when Thomas Campbell wrote the *Declaration and Address* he was still an unimmersed believer, and at that time had not given the subject of baptism any particular consideration. That was to come later. And yet it was in his third proposition that he laid down the principle that called for an examination of immersion as the door into the church.

Nothing ought to be inculcated upon christians as articles of faith, nor required of them as terms of communion, but what is expressly taught and enjoined upon them in the word of God. Nor ought anything to be admitted as of divine obligation in their church constitution and managements but what is expressly enjoined by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles upon the New Testament church, either in express terms or by approved precedent.

Obviously enough Campbell was thinking negatively when he wrote this proposition, for he was concerned about the creedal demands made of believers before they would be accepted into the various sectarian groups. It was sins of *commission* that the churches were committing through their creeds that bothered him rather than sins of *omission*, which would later concern him. For one to be accepted as a Christian and enjoy the fellowship of the saints he must first become a Calvinist or an Armenian, or something. He must subscribe to this or that creed, for creeds were made the basis of communion.

It is noteworthy that at about the same time Thomas Campbell penned this proposition, his son, in college back in Glasgow, was refusing to take the Lord's supper when it passed before him at the hands of Anti-Burgher Presbyterian elders, for other Christians were debarred. In his hand he held the token that gave him the privilege, but he chose to drop the token in its proper place and let the emblems pass by him untouched. This act marked young Campbell's break with a sectarian basis of fellowship. His father was taking the same steps in America. It is significant that in both cases it was an experience with the Lord's supper that precipitated the change.

Most of the divisions that mar the peace of the disciple brotherhood in our time would have been averted if this principle had been heeded. Make a list of the things that have been the occasion for ugly separations between brothers in Christ and you will discover that in each instance it was something *not* "expressly enjoined" in the word of God.

Some of us today are saying it this way: *Nothing should be made a basis for fellowship that God has not made a condition for being saved.*

This was Campbell's point precisely. Unless it is *expressly taught and enjoined* in the Bible, it cannot be made a basis of communion.

How about instrumental music?

How about missionary societies or Herald of Truth?

How about theories about the millennium?

Or Sunday Schools? Or literature?

Or the manner of serving the Lord's supper?

Campbell conceded that men might have creeds so long as they are not made the basis of fellowship. We should allow the same liberty of opinion. It may be my *opinion,* based upon what I believe to be good reasons, that the congregation of Christ should not use instruments of music in the corporate worship. If the saints where I meet share this opinion, then we should be extended the liberty of being *non*-instrumental. But Campbell's principle is violated if we become *anti*-instrumental by making our opinion a law for others. An assembly down the way from us may have the opinion that the instrument is a permissable aid to the singing and thus choose to employ it. Since this is not a matter "expressly taught and enjoined," we should accept the assembly in question as our beloved brothers.

Knowledge and Fellowship

In the eighth proposition Campbell makes a point that is vital to the problem of fellowship with us today. How much knowledge is required before one enters into fellowship with Christ? Every sectarian requires that the point of doctrine that distinguishes his own sect from all others be made a condition to fellowship. When Thomas Campbell first came to this country as a particular type of Presbyterian, he was to learn that to remain within that sect he had to deny fellowship to all other Christians, even other Presbyterians.

It is the same story within our parties. It is not enough to be *non*-instrumental. One must be *anti*-instrumental. Among the non-Sunday School factions, it is not sufficient simply to be indifferent about it and be non-Sunday School by chance of cirmumstance. It must be made a test of fellowship. And we are all guilty, or have been, for one reason or another, for all our parties have drawn lines on all the rest.

Some insist that one must *know* certain things (but not all!) about baptism before his immersion is acceptable, and in this manner reject the Baptists. One must know, for instance, that his immersion is for the remission of sins. They do not bother to insist that he know that such an act puts one "into Christ" or brings seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord, which are equally scriptural in import. For some reason it is always "for the remission of sins" that one must know about.

Campbell's proposition could help us along this line. *That as it is not necessary that persons should have a particular knowledge or distinct apprehension of all divinely revealed truths in order to entitle them to a place in the church; neither should they, for this purpose, be required to make a profession more extensive than their knowledge.*

He goes on to make it clear that fellowship is based upon what a disciple *believes,* not how much he knows about the scriptures. It is "a profession of their faith in and obedience to him" that is absolutely necessary to qualify them for admission into his church.

How often do we require disciples to make a profession that reaches beyond both their conviction and their knowledge? For decades now we have insisted that people be immersed who have already submitted to that act at the hands of others. Since their knowledge of this point or that is not what we think it ought to be, we baptize them over again. This is a sin that our pioneers did not commit. They would not have considered reimmersing a Baptist. The *Firm Foundation,* now a respected paper among us, exists in mute testimony to the ugly fight over this question back in the 1880's. It was started in order to champion the cause of reimmersion, all on the assumption of a relationship between knowledge and fellowship.

It is much nearer the truth to say that one doesn't have to know anything to enter into Christian fellowship, and his understanding of the scriptures may be nil. If he realizes that he is lost and believes that Christ is his Savior, he is ready for immersion into Christ. And all other Christians should accept him as within the fellowship, irrespective of their personal opinions about one thing or another.

Campbell's principles on the nature of the church would deliver us from many of our impediments if we would but heed them. The fellowship that he envisioned and gave his life for is far beyond the sectarian devices that we have created. His principles would appeal to the Christian world in its concern for ecumenism if the heirs of the Campbell movement could themselves implement them by overcoming their own divisive ways. We have the odd combination of both the cure and the disease.—*the Editor*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL MEETS A GREAT DOCUMENT

It is a matter of record that Alexander Campbell, son of the author of the *Declaration and Address,* was greatly influenced by that document. It is what catapulted him into his life work of restoration. The following excerpts are from *The Fool of God by* Louis Cochran, published by Bethany Press, and reproduced here by permission from the publisher.

Though a novel, the account is based on historical fact, and we esteem these selections as among the best in the book and indicative of the impact of the essay upon Alexander Campbell. This will be a prelude to an article by Mr. Cochran on "Alexander Campbell and the Declaration and Address," which we will place before our readers in the next issue.

We trust the reading will also encourage you to read *The Fool of God,* which my wife and I have

recently read aloud together our second time. We find the experience wonderfully edifying.—*the Editor*

"While you and Tommie were out in the woods," he said, turning to Alexander, "Mr. Sample brought over the proof sheets of the 'Declaration and Address.' Wife and the girls and I have been examining them. Now I'd like your opinion. I'll excuse you from conducting school this afternoon so you can look them over."

It was almost five o'clock and getting dark before Alexander, seated at the table in the upstairs bedroom which Father Thomas had set aside as a study, had finished the last of the fifty-six closely printed sheets. Normally a fast reader, he had found himself lingering over the pages, flavoring the meaning of the formalized Addisonian sentences; measuring their pronouncements against his own thinking. And as he read and pondered and read again, the conviction grew that this simple, unassuming Presbyterian clergy who was his father had come upon a vision—a vision born as much of the Holy Spirit as had been that of Martin Luther when he rose from his knees upon the scarred stairway in Rome. This document, the "Declaration and Address of the Christian Association of Washington," as written by Thomas Campbell in a little attic room in the home of Nathan Welch, was no ordinary document. It was a Magna Charta, a religious declaration of independence.

And yet, he thought, the futility of it. How did this obscure little man in this remote part of the world hope to effect a revolution among the great, entrenched organized sects? How could he dream of success when so many reformers had failed? He thought of Robert and James Alexander Haldane, of Greville Ewing and Alexander Carson in distant Scotland—powerful, eloquent, famous men. Yet their teaching were little more than a disruptive influence; their followers already known as a separate sect.

He picked up the proofs and ruffled the pages. The three pages of the first part, the "Declaration," set forth the reasons, purpose, and form of the organization of the Christian Association. The next part, the "Address," covered eighteen pages, listing thirteen principles as a means for the unification at all branches of the Christian religion. The Appendix answered actual and anticipated criticism.

He closed his eyes for a moment and put his elbows on the cable, resting his chin in his open palms, a sympathy akin to pity in his heart for this father who had dared so greatly and against such odds. There were only strife and division in Zion, and a call for Christian unity would be interpreted only as the birth cry of another sect. He shuffled the pages again, reluctant to admit that he could not share the grandeur of the dream. Aimlessly now, probing his mind for answers he did not find, scanning the pages briefly, he came again to the thirteen propositions.

> Proposition 1. That the Church of Christ upon earth is essentially, intentionally, and constitutionally one; consisting of all those in every place that profess their faith in Christ and obedience to Him in all things according to the Scriptures.

For a moment Alexander stared at the words. All obedient believers in Christ were Christian brothers to Father Thomas as they were to him. But that was revolutionary doctrine; it was anathema to the clergy; heresy which no established church would accept in America any more than in Scotland. But it was the truth, a truth that could break down all barriers between churches once it was accepted. He read on, as though fearful the words would fade before his eyes.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

WINFRED ERNEST GARRISON, 1874-1969

EDWARD G. HOLLEY

Just a few days before his death, Dr. Winfred Ernest Garrison whispered to one of his friends, “I’ve had a myocardial infarction and the angel of the Lord is hovering near.” Shortly afterwards, on February 6, he quietly passed away at the age of 94 at Bayou Manor in Houston. Memorial services for this distinguished Disciples scholar, writer, and educator were held at First Christian Church on Saturday, February 8. At the conclusion of the services the congregation joined the church choir in singing one of Dr. Garrison’s own hymns, “God of our Fathers, the Strength of Our People,” from *Christian Worship, a Hymnal*, The last verse seemed particularly appropriate for our age:

God of all peoples, let justice and peace like a river
Flow through the world until all, in one common endeavor,
Build among men brotherhood’s kingdom, and then
Thine be the glory forever.

Few men have been as much a legend in their own time as Winfred E. Garrison. The possessor of numerous earned and honorary degrees, he had served as president of three institutions: Butler University, Highlands University, and State University of New Mexico. From 1921 to 1927 he was dean of the Disciples Divinity House, University of Chicago, and from 1921 to 1943 was first Associate Professor and then Professor of Church History at the University of Chicago. In 1951 he came out of retirement to be Professor of Philosophy and Religion at the University of Houston from which he again retired in 1964 at the age of 89. He was Assistant Editor of the *Christian-Evangelist* from 1900-1904 and Literary Editor of the *Christian Century* from 1923-1955. He was a poet, violinist, and sculptor of bronze works which are displayed in various colleges and churches in the United States and Ireland.

However important his interests in scholarship and learning, even more important was Dr. Garrison's interest in people. His personal warmth and humor cheered everyone whose life touched his. As recently as last August my eleven-year-old son and I had driven him to the University of Houston campus so that he could see the new addition to the M. D. Anderson Memorial Library. We also wanted him to see the new location of his own portrait in our Humanities Reading Room. Dr. Garrison was frail even then. 'Tm tottering, but not doddering," he remarked. And indeed he wasn't. Up until the last he maintained that keen interest in scholarship and people that marked his last professorship.

Later, reminiscing in his apartment, he took a book down from the shelves and handed it to Gailon. "Here, Gailon," he said, "is my first book. It helps a little if your father owns the publishing firm." The volume was his *Wheeling through Europe,* an account of a bicycle tour, published in St. Louis in 1900, where his father was then editing the *Christian-Evangelist.* Between that date and the end of his life he published numerous books, articles, and book reviews in church history, religion and poetry. Most of the major church historians of the first half of the twentieth century were his friends, including the recently deceased dean of American church historians, Kenneth Scott Latourette. His alma mater, Yale, named a lectureship for him. Within the past decade Dr. Garrison had completed Paul Hutchinson's *20 Centuries of Christianity* after that author's untimely death, served as Publisher's critic for Roland Bainton's *Horizon History of Christianity,* and completed "an anthology of poems as aids to reflections," *Singing Sages* (1966). Equally impressive to his close friends was his own poetry collected under the title *Thy Sea So Great* (1965).

For the readers of the *Restoration Review,* Dr. Garrison's chief impact will have come through his historical work on the restoration movement. In his *Religion Follows the Frontier, a History of the Disciples of Christ* (1931), Dr. Garrison lifted restoration history from the sectarianism in which it had wallowed to the level of first rate church history. In line with the then emerging currents in American history, he sought to relate the religious movement to the cultural and intellectual milieu of which it was a part. This pioneering work was followed by his *An American Religious Movement, a Brief History of the Disciples of Christ* (1945), *Christian Unity and the Disciples of Christ* (1955), and, with A. T. DeGroot, the two definitive editions of *The Disciples of Christ, a History* (1948 and 1958). As Roscoe M. Pierson has noted, "the historiography of the Disciples reached full maturity with the publications of Winfred E. Garrison."

Moreover, he was an active trustee of the Disciples of Christ Historical Society. As the "Dean of Disciple Historians" his likeness appears along with those of Alexander Campbell and Robert Richardson in the stained glass windows of the Society's Lecture Hall, the only living church historian to be so honored.

He took pride in the fact that all segments of the restoration movement were welcome at the Society and were beginning to come to its support. From sifting through his books prior to his move to Bayou Manor several years ago, I can attest that all segments of the restoration brotherhood regularly honored him with autographed copies of their books and articles.

Yet Dr. Garrison's interests were much broader than the movement into which he was born (his father was editor of the *Christian-Evangelist* from 1869 to 1912). His interest in ecumenical affairs led to his attendance as a delegate or official consultant to world church conferences in Oxford, Edinburgh, Amsterdam, Lund (Sweden), and Evanston. However, he was never a blind member of such groups and it seems just to say that he was as little interested in a monolithic Protestant Church as he was in a monolithic Roman Catholic Church. For many reasons it is rather unfortunate that what he regarded as one of his best books, *Quest and Character of a United Church* (1955), has received relatively so little attention. Perhaps this is because of his lucid treatment of the consistent failure of certain doctrinal attempts toward unity. Neither fundamentalists nor ecumenists cared much for his view that doctrinal uniformity had not been the road to unity from the primitive church to the present day. Rather it was his view that realistically the best one could hope for was a feeling of brotherliness, of fraternity, among various kinds of Christians. Restorationists of all persuasions might consider well his plea for such basic principles as liberty, loyalty, mutual love, and shared responsibility.

This feeling of brotherly concern Dr. Garrison expressed not only in his writings but in his personal relationships as well. It was part and parcel of his religion that he felt brotherly concern for all, from the freshman student to the distinguished professor. In my experience in academic life, few professors have been so much respected not only for their scholarly attainments but also for their genuine religious faith as was Winfred E. Garnson.

_____

Edward G. Holley is director of libraries, University of Houston.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

READERS' EXCHANGE

Concern

It pains me too to live in a fragmented brotherhood. The only thing I know to do is to try and not fan the flames of discord, and to promote Christianity in a positive way.—*Texas* (a fellow editor)

It has only been a short time since I began to open my eyes and think for myself. It has been a marvelous thing and has brought me near to the Lord in a way I had never known. I do believe, however, that there are some things that we must keep ourselves aware of: 1. We can grow so accustomed to debunking and exposing that we become cynical. 2. We can mistake freedom in Christ for license and develop an attitude of "Look at me. I've kicked over the traces and renounced Church of Christism. I'm uninhibited and anything that is wild and way out I will accept." To me one who does this is letting the church make his decisions just as surely as the most cowed member of all. I have seen both attitudes and I think we must be careful and *use our minds.—Texas*

This is the year of judgment for the Church of Christ, and the walkout at Harding is only a foretaste of what is to come. Like the children of Israel, we will listen to the Lord and obey His voice, or we will die in the wilderness.—*Texas*

While I am in complete sympathy with a continued fellowship among those of us who find that it is pleasant and fruitful, I don't have great hopes for the masses of our people getting much closer together. I shouldn't think that the "inquisition" which was held in Henderson, Tennessee, on Feb. 6 and reported in *Christian Chronicle,* April 28, 1969, would help to heal the breach.—*Missouri* (a fellow editor)

Commendation

I enjoy very much reading *Restoration Review.* You certainly do hit the nail on the head.—*Mississippi*

Just a note to tell you how much I appreciate you recommending the little book *The Lord's Supper* by Warren Lewis. My sermon last Sunday on the Lord's Supper and my participation following was so much more meaningful because of the fresh thought contained in the booklet.—*Ohio*

I can't say exactly what it is that makes it so exciting to read. Maybe it identifies with my rebellious feelings on some of the attitudes of the brotherhood.—*California*

We love *Restoration Review* and we love you, Leroy Garrett, for blazing a courageous trail so that others may dare to say what they believe in their hearts. We are so happy and thankful to God that more and more of us are getting away from a lot of old traditional negativism and replacing it with a genuine realization that God created and loves every human being on this earth.—*California*

Colleges

The article on the Christian colleges was quite timely, but I' am afraid that I am not so optimistic. They are as ruthless as the SS or the old Stalinists, although their method may be more devious.—*New Mexico*

What you say about the colleges makes me feel bad deep inside, in spite of the fact you have hope. I am not so sure that God will maintain our institutions by His grace. He may have other ways to make truth known, and we may be getting in his way.—*New Mexico*

It is noteworthy that severest judgments on the Church of Christ colleges these days come from those who have been educated in them or served on their faculties, or both. It is true that institutionalism has a deadly grip upon brotherhood leadership, and there is reason for despair. But fresh reinforcements are arriving and the battle is by no means over. We will in the end win the war for a free and responsible community of God on earth.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

BOOK NOTES

Some years ago James Warren wrote an essay on *Legalism,* which was one of the first documents in our time to call for a change of attitude in the Church of Christ. It is a provocative and incisive piece of work and we commend it highly. You can get a free copy by writing to Jack Knight, Box 886, Conway, Ark. 72032.

Mrs. Rachel Howard, 3640 Main Street, Anderson, Ind. 46014, has prepared a book especially for women, entitled *In the Hands of a Woman.* Chapters such as O Foretaste of Heaven, A Wise Woman, The Beauty of Womanhood, and Obedient Wife or Henpecked Husband will interest you. Mrs. Howard is a sister in the Lord who has attended a number of our unity meetings. Order your book from her for 3.25 in clothback or 1.95 in paperback.

Our people have generally neglected devotional reading. One way to correct this is to read *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life* by William Law, which is now in paperback for only 1.45. His chapters on How to Please God and The Danger of Not Intending Our Best are most provocative. To read Law is a soul-searching experience. In the Introduction by Elton Trueblood it is pointed out that Law speaks to the twentieth century even though he was an eighteenth century teacher.

We sold our first supply of *Sex and Sanity* (only 1.45) and now have a new supply. Stuart Barton Babbage, the author, begins his study with an essay on The Body, which will impress you. He discusses promiscuity, sexuality, divorce, marriage, etc.

Religions of the East by Joseph Kitagawa is a study that includes Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, and the Chinese and Japanese religions. He shows that these religions are a way of life, not merely doctrinal systems. He points to the social significance, showing that these

religions emerge as living, dynamic faiths dominating the minds and actions of hundreds of millions of people. Only 2.95 in very attractive paperback edition.

Servants Without Hire by William Martin Smith is published by the Disciples of Christ Historical Society in Nashville, an organization that preserves the history of our Movement, all aspects of it, including Churches of Christ. It deserves our support. Their publications are worthwhile. This one is a study of the concept of ministry in our history, starting with the pioneers. It is placed in an historical context that you will enjoy reading, starting with the disciples on the frontier moving west. 2.50 in limited edition.

Special Offer! For only 5.00 we will send you *both* of Wuest's books on studies in Greek N. T. for those who do not know Greek. One is *The Practical Use of the Greek New Testament* and the other is *Bypaths in the Greek New Testament.* Once you've studied these two, which are nontechnical and eye-opening, you'll want the rest of Wuest's works, which we can supply. These are durable, clothbound volumes. A real bargain.

Back issues of *Restoration Review* are now 20 cents each or 6 for 1.00. We still have most of our monthly issues (since 1964) and about nine of the quarterly issues of the 20 printed issues prior to 1964, but these are 3 for 1.00.

To those who have ordered *A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to Heaven* by Gary Freeman we regret to report that the publisher has announced a delay in shipping. We are looking for it any day, and it will be sent on to you at once. Others of you may place your order at 3.95.

The Quest of God, the bound volume of this journal for 1968, has been mailed to those who ordered it. It is a 200-page book, with an introduction and index, bound in green with gold lettering and matching dust jacket. You may have one for only 3.00.

FOURTH ANNUAL UNITY FORUM IN NEW YORK

The Fourth Annual Unity Forum is sponsored by the West Islip Church of Christ, 600 Montauk Highway, West Islip, long Island, New York 11795. It starts Thursday evening at 6 with a dinner, July 3, and continues until the afternoon of Saturday, July 5. You are invited by the elders of the congregation. The speakers are Dr. Tom Olbricht, professor at Abilene Christian College; Dr. Robert Shaw, pastor, First Christian Church, Miami, Fla.; Dr. Robert Fife, professor at Milligan College; Carl Ketcherside, editor of *Mission Messenger;* and Leroy Garrett. Emphasis will be on group study, the leaders of which will include Paul Dubois, Carl Stem, Tom Langford, and Charles Fordyce. Dr. Kenneth Schrable of Concord, California will be director of the group study. Dwain Evans, minister at West Islip, is coordinator of the forum. Call him at 516-JU7-1155 for further details. lodging and meals at reasonable prices are available.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

RESTORATION REVIEW is published monthly (except July and August) at 1201 Windsor Dr., Denton, Texas. Leroy Garrett, Editor. Second class permit at Denton, Texas. Subscription rate is $1.00 per annum; 50 cents in clubs of 6 or more.

Address all mail to: 1201 Windsor Drive, Denton, Texas 76201.*